

REMARKS

The Final Office Action (hereinafter the Action) mailed August 2, 2006 has been reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 1-10 remain pending in this application and currently stand rejected. Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1 and 8 are amended to clarify the claimed subject matter. No new matter has been added. For further prosecution of this application, the Applicants submit the following remarks. The claims as presented are believed to be in allowable condition.

Interview Summary

A phone interview was held with the Examiner on October 4, 2006 at 1.00 pm. The Examiner agreed that, among other features, the automatically determining a consistent formatting of a group of cells feature of the independent claims appears to overcome the cited reference *Adler*, and the claims may be allowed subject to a new search by the Examiner. An RCE request is being filed along with this amendment and response.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Action rejected claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,768,158 to Adler, *et al.* (hereinafter *Adler*). The rejection of these claims is respectfully traversed.

Amended claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "automatically determining that the list of cells has a consistent format; and automatically extending the consistent format to include the previously blank newly edited cell." The amendments are supported by the Specification (page 2, line 26 - 29 "without user instruction"). According to amended claim 1, a consistent format shared by a list of cells is automatically determined before extending the consistent format to a newly edited cell. Also, "format" as used in claim 1, refers to background color, font face, borders, and the like (See Specification, page 5, lines 17-19, page 5, lines 22-25, page 16-20, and so on).

Adler teaches an electronic spreadsheet, providing a user with improved data processing capability that includes displaying a visual presentation to the user, the visual presentation

including a matrix. The electronic spreadsheet according to *Adler* permits the user to input and manipulate data, through the use of standard computer input and pointing devices (i.e., keyboard, mouse, trackball, joystick, touchscreen, etc.), and to view the results of the data processing performed by the electronic spreadsheet, through the use of a standard CRT display (*Adler*, Abstract and column 3, line 64 - column 4, line 9).

Adler discloses that the plurality of visual formats are preferably user-selectable (*Adler*, column 5, lines 31-32). While *Adler* discusses using different colors for cells of a particular data type (*Adler*, column 12, lines 48-55) and manipulating attributes of a visual presentation such as color, font, border width (*Adler*, column 16, lines 1-4), *Adler* does not teach determining or setting (extending) these automatically. In fact, *Adler* specifically refers to user select functions indicating these functions are left to the user to determine or to set (*Adler*, column 15, line 67 among others).

Furthermore, "format" as used in *Adler* refers to graphs, charts, and histograms (*Adler*, column 11, lines 22-27, column 14, lines 33-35). Hence, there is not only terminology difference, but *Adler* does not disclose cell formats as described in the present application such as background color, borders, font face, and the like.

Thus, *Adler* does not teach or suggest automatically determining that the list of cells has a consistent format; and automatically extending the consistent format to include the previously blank newly edited cell, where the format refers to background color, font face, borders, and the like. Accordingly, *Adler* fails to teach, disclose, or suggest the features specified in amended claim 1. Therefore, amended claim 1 is allowable and the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn.

Claims 2-7 depend from amended independent claim 1. Thus, these dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to amended claim 1. Furthermore, amended independent claim 8 includes similar limitation as amended claim 1, and is allowable at least for the same reasons. Claims 9 and 10 depend from independent claim 8, therefore, based on the foregoing the rejection of claims 9 and 10 should also be withdrawn.

U.S. Application No. 10/667,543
Amendment and Response dated October 20, 2006
Response to Final Office Action dated August 2, 2006

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and reexamination of the application and allowance of the claims at an early date are hereby solicited. If the Examiner has any questions or comments concerning this matter, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicants' undersigned attorney at the number below.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD, PC



D. Kent Stier
Reg. No. 57,036

Date: October 20, 2006

MERCHANT & GOULD, PC
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(404) 954-5100

27488
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE